

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed December 3, 2008 has been received and reviewed. Each of claims 16, 19-24 and 26-45 stands rejected. Claims 16, 21, 26, and 32 have been amended herein. Care has been exercised to introduce no Previously Presented subject matter. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 32-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 33-45 depend from claim 32. Claim 32 has been amended herein. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is moot.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 27-31 depend from claim 26. Independent claim 26 has been amended herein. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is moot.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Title 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) declares, a patent shall not issue when “the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.” The Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere* counseled that an obviousness determination is made by identifying: the scope and content of the prior art; the level of ordinary skill in the prior art; the differences between the claimed invention and prior art references; and secondary considerations. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966).

To support a finding of obviousness, the initial burden is on the Office to apply the framework outlined in *Graham* and to provide some “articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1741, 82 USPQ2d at 1396 (quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006) with approval).” *See also* MPEP § 2142. “[R]ejections on obviousness cannot be sustained with mere conclusory statements.” *Id.* Thus, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness the Office must provide “a clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious” based on factual findings made while conducting the *Graham* factual inquiries. *See* MPEP § 2143. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit. *Id.*

Claims 16, 19, 21-24, 26, 27 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0149705, hereinafter the “Allen reference”) in view of Balasuriya (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0041048, hereinafter the “Balasuriya reference”) further in view of Heatley (U.S. Patent No. 7,164,936, hereinafter the “Heatley reference”). As the asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest all of the features set forth in the rejected claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as hereinafter set forth.

Claim 16

Independent claim 16 recites a method for facilitating electronic communications management by a system user. The method includes *generating a unique reference for the system user. The unique reference is required for identities to access a unique identity belonging to the system user. The method also includes permitting access to the unique identity belonging to the system user through the unique reference, wherein the unique identity comprises a plurality of components and the plurality of components are defined to include a plurality of electronic devices. The method also includes allowing the system user to alter any one of the plurality of components without altering the unique reference. The method also includes providing the system user with **tools for regulating access to the plurality of components such that only selected known identities have access to selected components of the plurality of components, wherein the selected components of the plurality components are authorized, by the system user, to accept electronic communications from the selected known identities, wherein the unique reference is required to be used by the selected known identities to communicate with the selected components.** Further, the method includes allowing the system user to select a particular communications delivery method for receiving communications from each of the selected known identities.*

To the contrary, the Allen reference is directed to a remote control that includes a display screen configured to display a contact list that is comprised of contacts. *See Allen reference*, Abstract. A user of the remote control may establish communication with one of the contacts of the contact list. *Id.* The Allen reference is clearly direct to a user of the remote control establishing an **outgoing** communication channel with a contact that is displayed as part of a contact list. Further, the user of the remote control may establish the outgoing

communication with a contact wherein the user may select a particular device of the contact in which the outgoing communication will be communicated. *See Allen reference*, ¶ [0043]. For example, ¶ [0043] of the Allen reference states “a user of a hybrid communicator/remote control 106 may rapidly and easily establish a two-way communication channel with any of the illustrated devices...” Therefore, the Allen reference merely allows an initiator of communication (i.e., user of the remote) to select a device of the recipient contact (i.e., contact of contact list) in which the communication will be established. This is completely contrary to the present invention.

For example, the Office asserts the Allen reference teaches or suggests *providing the system user with tools for regulating access to the plurality of components such that only selected known identities have access to selected components of the plurality of components, wherein the selected components of the plurality components are authorized, by the system user, to **accept** electronic communications from the selected known identities. See Final Office Action dated 12/03/2008*, p. 7. Therefore, the invention of claim 16 is clearly directed to regulating incoming communications by allowing the recipient of communication (i.e., system user) to regulate access of incoming communications to selected components (e.g., a subset of the plurality of components). For example, the system user may select a particular device from a plurality of associated devices for receiving communications from a particular contact. *See Specification*, ¶[0010].¹

Applicant respectfully submits that the regulating of incoming communication by regulating which devices a particular contact may access is fundamentally different from the Allen reference. For example, the Office asserts that ¶¶ [0034], [0043], [0091]-[00992], and

¹ All references herein to the Specification are directed to the as-filed Specification.

[0101] of the Allen reference support the Offices assertion that the following features of claim 16 where taught or suggested by the Allen reference. *See Final Office Action*, p. 7. *Providing the system user with tools for regulating access to the plurality of components such that only selected known identities have access to selected components of the plurality of components, wherein the selected components of the plurality components are authorized, by the system user, to accept electronic communications from the selected known identities.* However, it is respectfully submitted that the Allen reference in general and the cited paragraphs in particular fail to teach or suggest the same.

Paragraph [0034] of the Allen reference merely discusses a remote control that may communicate with a set-top-box using either infrared , radio frequency, or other wireless technology. However, it is respectfully submitted that the discussion of a transmission medium (e.g., infrared) in no way teaches or suggests *tools for regulating access to the plurality of components* or any other feature for which it is asserted.

Paragraph [0043] of the Allen reference merely discusses a remote control that may be utilized to establish (e.g., outgoing) communication with a plurality of different devices. However, the establishment of a communication channel is fundamentally different from *regulating access to the plurality of components*. For example, the recipient of the established communication in the Allen reference has no way of regulating with which of the components the remote control will establish a communication channel. Instead, the user of the remote may select any of the components in which the user decides to utilize to communicate with the contact. Therefore, ¶ [0043] is fundamentally different as it is directed to establishing an outgoing communication channel with any of a plurality of components and it in no way teaches

or suggests *selected components of the plurality components are **authorized**, by the system user, to accept electronic communications from the selected known identities.*

Paragraphs [0091]-[0092] of the Allen reference are merely directed to the updating a contact in a contact list of the remote control. At the most, the user of the remote control may receive one or more contacts from an external device. *See Allen reference, ¶ [0092].* However, the reception of a contact from an external device in no way teaches or suggests *tools for regulating access to the plurality of components such that only selected known identities have access to selected components of the plurality of components.* For example, the reception of a contact from an external device merely allows for the “transfer of information related to the new contact to the hybrid communicator / remote control...” *Id.* Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the updating of a new contact to a contact list fails to teach or suggest any of the features for which it is asserted.

Finally, paragraph [0101] of the Allen reference is merely directed to allowing a user of the remote control to select a contact from a contact list to obtain an address of the contact. Once again, it is respectfully submitted that the selection of a contact from a contact list in no way teaches or suggests the features for which it is asserted. For example, the selection of a contact fails to provide a *system user with tools for regulating access to the plurality of components such that only selected known identities have access to selected components of the plurality of components.* Instead, at the most, the user of the Allen reference remote control may select a particular address of the selected contact, but this fails to regulate access to a plurality of device under the control of the user who is selecting the address.

For at least the above described reasons and those presented in previous responses, it is respectfully submitted that the Allen reference, either alone or in combination

with the other references relied upon by the Office, fails to teach or suggest *providing the system user with tools for regulating access to the plurality of components such that only selected known identities have access to selected components of the plurality of components, wherein the selected components of the plurality components are authorized, by the system user, to accept electronic communications from the selected known identities.*

Continuing with claim 16, it is respectfully submitted that the Allen, Balysuriya, and Heatly references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest *allowing the system user to select a particular communications delivery method for receiving communications from each of the selected known identities.* The Office asserts that the Allen reference at paragraphs [0091], [0094], and [0104] supports the assertion that such features are taught or suggested. *See Final Office Action*, p. 7. However, as discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the Allen reference in general and the asserted portion in particular fail to teach or suggest the same.

Paragraph [0091] of the Allen reference, as previously discussed, is merely directed to adding a contact to a contact list. The addition of a contact from a list (e.g., recent call list) does not imply that a system user may select a particular communications delivery method for **receiving communications** from each of the selected known identities. Instead, to the contrary, adding of a contact to a contact list would allow an outgoing communication to be established. Further, the adding of a contact in no way teaches or suggests selecting a particular communications delivery method, but only indicates that a contact may be added to a list from another list.

Paragraph [0094] of the Allen reference is merely directed to converting outgoing verbal messages to text messages. The conversion of a verbal message to a text message prior to

communication is fundamentally different from selecting *a particular communications delivery method for receiving communications from each of the selected known identities*. For example, the conversion of an **outgoing** message fails to teach or suggest selecting a particular communications delivery method for **receiving** communications. The Allen reference lets the communicator, not the recipient control the method in which the communication is communicated, which is exactly opposite of the invention claimed in claim 16. Further, at no point does the Allen reference teach or suggest selecting a particular communications delivery method for **each** of the selected known identities. Instead, the Allen reference is silent as to allowing a user of the remote control to select a particular recipient that is to receive the verbal message as a text message. *See Allen generally.*

Finally, paragraph [0104] of the Allen reference is merely directed to establishing a communication channel with an address of a selected contact. It is respectfully submitted that the establishment of a communication channel based on an address fails to teach or suggest *allowing the system user to select a particular communications delivery method for receiving communications from each of the selected known identities*. As discussed previously, the establishment of a communication channel by a user to communicate with a contact in no way teaches or suggests allowing a system user to select a particular communications delivery method for receiving communications from each of the selected (e.g., subset of the plurality of known identities) identities.

Also contrary to claim 16, the Heatly reference is merely directed to a user of a mobile phone to establish a restricted delivery mode that is applied to all incoming communications. *See Heatly reference, Abstract*. For example, a user of a mobile phone may set a message mode that results in a “Message Only – Leave Message” announcement to the

incoming caller. *Id.* It is respectfully submitted that at no point in the Heatly reference is a user of a mobile phone allowed to selectively set a message mode for each of a subset of known identities. Therefore, the Heatly reference merely allows a generic message mode to be established that is non-discriminatory as to which incoming callers the announcement is played.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Allen reference as modified by the Balasuriya reference and the Heatly reference does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 16. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Allen, Balasuriya, and Heatly references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 16. Therefore, a case of obviousness has not been established for independent claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 16 is believed to be in condition for allowance and such favorable action is respectfully requested

Claims 19, and 21-24 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 16. As such, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of these claims as well.

Claim 26

Claim 26 recites system having a processor and memory for *allowing a user having a unique identity to manage communications, wherein the unique identity is associated with a plurality of electronic devices.* The system includes *a service utilizing the processor and memory for generating and assigning a unique reference to a user's unique identity such that the unique reference is a pointer to the user's unique identity, wherein an authorized identity can access the user's unique identity to communicate with the user only by using the unique reference.* The system also includes *permission controls utilizing the processor and memory for*

allowing the user to control access to the unique identity by restricting authorization to a selected set of other identities which includes the authorized identity. The system also includes *preference controls utilizing the processor and memory for allowing the user to select at least one device from a plurality of devices associated with the user, the at least one device is selected for receiving communication upon an access attempt by the authorized identity using the unique reference.*

It is respectfully submitted that the Allen, Balasuriya, and Heatly references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 26. For example, the Office asserts that paragraphs [0092]-[0094] of the Allen reference teach or suggest *permission controls utilizing the processor and memory for allowing the user to control access to the unique identity by restricting authorization to a selected set of other identities which includes the authorized identity* as recited in claim 26. *See Final Office Action*, p. 10. However, as previously discussed, paragraphs [0092]-[0094] of the Allen reference are merely directed adding a contact to a contact list, wherein the contact includes an address that facilitates the user of the remote establishing a communication channel with the contact. *See generally, Allen reference*, ¶¶ [0092]-[0094]. As previously discussed the adding of a contact and then establishing a communication channel with the contact in no way teaches or suggests *allowing the user to control access to the unique identity*. For example, in the Allen reference, the recipient of a communication (i.e., the contact being contacted) in no way is taught or suggested as being able to control access that is provided to the incoming caller (i.e., the user of the remote control). Therefore, the Allen reference cannot teach or suggest *permission controls for allowing the user to control access to the unique identity by restricting authorization to a selected set of other identities which includes the authorized identity*. As a result, it is respectfully submitted

that the addition of a contact to a contact list and the establishing of a communication channel with the contact fails to teach or suggest the same.

The Office further asserts that the Allen reference at paragraphs [0034], [0043], and [0092]-[0094] teaches or suggests *preference controls for allowing the user to select at least one device from a plurality of devices associated with the user, **the at least one device is selected for receiving communication upon an access attempt by the authorized identity using the unique reference.*** See *Final Office Action*, p. 10. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Allen reference in general and as cited in particular, fails to teach or suggest the features for which it is relied to teach or suggest.

Paragraph [0034] of the Allen reference, as previously discussed, is merely directed to communication between a remote control and a set-top-box utilizing infrared, radio frequency, or other wireless technology. It is respectfully submitted that in no way does the manner in which remote control communicates with a set-top-box teach or suggest preference controls as defined in claim 26. For example, regardless if infrared or radio frequency is used by the remote control of the Allen reference, the remote control does not include *preference controls for allowing the user to select at least one device from a plurality of devices associated with the user, **the at least one device is selected for receiving communication upon an access attempt by the authorized identity using the unique reference.*** Even when looking at the Allen reference in general, at the most a user of the remote control can do is select a particular device in which the remote control is to establish a communication channel. See *Allen reference*, ¶[0043]. However, the selection of a device in which a sender of a communication is establishing is fundamentally different than selecting a device **for receiving communication upon an access attempt by the authorized identity.**

Paragraph [0043] of the Allen reference, as previously discussed, is merely directed to establishing a communication channel with a device. For example, in the Allen reference, the user of the remote control may select a contact that the user wishes to call. *See Allen generally.* Upon selection of the contact, a communication channel is established between the user and the contact. At no point is the contact of the Allen reference allowed to select *at least one device for **receiving communication** upon an access attempt by the authorized identity using the unique reference.* Instead, the user of the Allen reference remote selects a device in which the user desires to establish communication.

Paragraphs [0092]-[0094] of the Allen reference, as previously discussed, are directed to adding a contact to a contact list and converting an outgoing verbal message to text message. Once again, it is respectfully submitted that at no point is either the remote control or the device being contacted in the Allen reference taught or suggested to include *preference controls for allowing a user (i.e., recipient of the call, contact of Allen reference) to select at least one device from a plurality of devices associated with the user, the at least one device is selected for **receiving communication** upon an access attempt by the authorized identity using the unique reference.*

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Allen reference as modified by the Balasuriya reference and the Heatly reference does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 26. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Allen, Balasuriya, and Heatly references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 26. Therefore, a case of obviousness has not been established for independent claim 26. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 26 is believed to be in condition for allowance and such favorable action is respectfully requested

Claims 27 and 29-31 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 26. As such, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of these claims as well.

Claim 32

Claims 32-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Allen reference in view of Burgess (U.S. Patent 6,359,970 hereinafter the “Burgess reference”) further in view of the Heatley reference.

Claim 32 recites *a method for managing electronic communications directed to an identity owner by way of a unique identity that is accessible by a unique reference, wherein the unique identity is associated with a plurality of electronic devices of the identity owner. The method includes **receiving, from the identity owner, an indication of a user that is authorized to communicate with the identity owner**, wherein the user establishes communication with the identity owner by way of the unique identity, and wherein the unique identity utilizes the plurality of electronic devices to facilitate the communication from the user to the identity owner. The method also includes **storing, in the unique identity, the authorization of the user to communicate with the identity owner**. The method also includes receiving, from the identity owner, **an indication as to which of the plurality of electronic devices are allowed to be utilized in the reception of a communication from the user regardless of a communication mode utilized by the user to establish the communication***². The method also includes *storing, in the*

² See Specification,¶[0010] (Preference controls for allowing the [identity owner] to select at least one associated device from a plurality of associated devices for receiving communication upon an access attempt by an authorized user.)

unique identity, the indication as to which electronic devices are allowed to receive a communication from the user to the identity owner. The method also includes *generating the unique reference that is the only reference useable by the user to access the unique identity in order to communicate with the identity owner, wherein accessing the unique identity is the only way for the user to establish a communication with the identity owner, and wherein a communication from the user is routed to the identity owner according to the stored indication as to which electronic devices are allowed to receive a communication from the user.*

It is respectfully submitted that the Allen, Burgess, and Heatly reference, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features for which they are asserted. For example, the Office relies on Fig. 6, Fig. 7, ¶¶ [0060], [0063]-[0066], [0091]-[0093], and [0101] of the Allen reference to support that *receiving, from the identity owner, an indication of a user that is authorized to communicate with the identity owner, wherein the user establishes communication with the identity owner by way of the unique identity* is taught or suggested by the Allen reference. *See Final Office Action*, p. 12. However, as discussed in detail above and additionally below, the Allen reference fails to teach or suggest the features for which it is relied upon to teach or suggest.

Figures 6 and 7 of the Allen reference, along with their associated disclosures, merely discuss a hybrid remote and a set-top-box for displaying a contact list and establishing a communication channel with a contact from the contact list. At no point in the Allen reference does an identity owner provide an indication of a user that is authorized to communicate with the identity owner. *See Allen reference generally.* At the most, the Allen reference is directed to a user of a remote control that provides an indication of a contact that the user of the remote desires to establish communications with. As discussed extensively throughout this response, it

is respectfully submitted that the establishment of a communication channel by the initiator of the communication (i.e., user of the Allen reference remote control) fails to authorize particular initiators to make contact with a recipient (i.e., identity owner of claim 32). Therefore, the Allen reference cannot teach or suggest the features for which it is relied upon.

Paragraphs [0060], [0063]-[0066],[0091]-[0093], and [0101] of the Allen reference are directed to selecting a contact from a contact list and adding a contact to the contact list. It is respectfully submitted that the selection of a contact or addition of a contact from a contact list fails to teach or suggest *receiving, from the identity owner, an indication of a user that is authorized to communicate with the identity owner, wherein the user establishes communication with the identity owner by way of the unique identity*. Instead, at the most, the addition of a contact to a contact list of the Allen reference merely indicates a contact that the user of the remote desires to establish a communication channel with. This is fundamentally different from authorizing contact to establish a communication channel with the user of the remote. For example, by adding a contact to the contact list of the Allen reference, the Allen reference does not discuss restricting or allowing the added contact to now establish communication with the user of the remote control. Therefore, the Allen reference cannot teach or suggest the features for which it is relied upon.

Further, the same paragraphs and Figures of the Allen reference fail to teach or suggest *storing, in the unique identity, the authorization of the user to communicate with the identity owner*. As previously discussed, the Allen reference fails to include any discussion that the storing of a contact in a contact list of the Allen reference, authorize the contact to communicate with the user of the remote control. *See Allen reference* generally. Instead, as discussed previously, the addition or selection of a contact from the Allen reference contact list

merely allows a user of the remote (e.g., initiator of the communication) to establish a communication with the contact (e.g., the recipient of the communication). The contact is not taught or suggested in the Allen reference to authorize the user of the remote control to communicate with the contact.

The Office additionally asserts the Allen reference teaches or suggest *an indication as to which of the plurality of electronic devices are allowed to be utilized in the reception of a communication from the user regardless of a communication mode utilized by the user to establish the communication*. See *Final Office Action*, p. 12. The Office relies on paragraphs [0022], [0034], [0043], [0066], and [0092] of the Allen reference to support the assertion.

The portions relied upon by the Office have been previously discussed. In general, the portions are directed to a remote, wireless technology for the remote to communicate with a set-top-box, and receiving contact information. See generally, *Allen reference*, ¶¶ [0022], [0034], [0043], [0066], and [0092]. As previously discussed, the Allen reference in general and in particular as cited, fails to teach or suggest *an indication as to which of the plurality of electronic devices are allowed to be utilized in the **reception** of a communication from the user*. At the most, the Allen reference allows a user of the remote control to select a device of a contact that the user desires to establish a communication channel with, but not a device of the contact that the user of the remote is authorized to contact. This is fundamentally different as previously discussed.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Allen reference as modified by the Burgess reference and the Heatly reference does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 32. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Allen, Burgess, and Heatly

references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 32. Therefore, a case of obviousness has not been established for independent claim 32. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 32 is believed to be in condition for allowance and such favorable action is respectfully requested

Claims 33-45 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 32. As such, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of these claims as well.

Claims 20 and 28

Claims 20 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Balasuriya further in view of Heatley further in view of Burgess. Claim 20 depends from independent claim 16. Claim 28 depends from independent claim 26. Both claims 16 and 26 were discussed herein above with respect to the Allen reference, the Balasuriya reference, and the Heatly reference.

The Burgess reference is directed to a call controller that identifies a caller ID of an incoming caller. The caller ID is then used to assign a priority level, which is used to block that caller during specified time block. *See Burgess reference*, Abstract. It is respectfully submitted that the Burgess reference fails to cure at the deficiencies of the Allen, Balasuriya, and Heatly references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Burgess reference fails to cure the deficiencies of the Allen, Balasuriya, and Heatly references with respect to claims 16 and 26. As such, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of these claims as well.

Claim 38

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Burgess further in view of Heatley further in view of Boman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,895,257, hereinafter the “Boman reference”).

Claim 38 depends from independent claim 32 discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that the Boman reference fails to cure the deficiencies of the Allen, Burgess, and Heatly references discussed above. As such, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of this claim as well.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 16 and 18-24, and 26-45 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or cwfisher@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 referencing Attorney Docket No. MFCP.101281.

Respectfully submitted,

/CORY W FISHER/

Cory W. Fisher
Reg. No. 59,366

CWF/tq
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550